arXiv:1211.0798v1 [hep-th] 5 Nov 2012

Energy Quantisation and Time Parameterisation

Alon E. Faraggi[1] and Marco Matone[2]

[1]Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZL, UK

[2]Dipartimento di Fisica “G. Galilei” and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare
Università di Padova, Via Marzolo, 8 – 35131 Padova, Italy

Abstract

We show that if space is compact, then time cannot be defined by Jacobi's theorem in the quantum Hamilton–Jacobi theory. The key point is that time parameterisation $t - t_0 = \partial_E \mathcal{S}_0$, implied by Jacobi's theorem and that leads to group velocity, is ill defined. This provides a stringent connection between the quantum HJ theory and the Copenhagen interpretation. Together with tunnelling and the energy quantization theorem for confining potentials, formulated in quantum HJ theory, it leads to the main features of the axioms of quantum mechanics from a unique geometrical principle. Similarly to the case of the classical HJ equation, this fixes its quantum analog by requiring that there exist point transformations, rather than canonical ones, leading to the trivial hamiltonian. This is equivalent to a basic cocycle condition on the states. Such a cocycle condition can be implemented on compact spaces, so that continuous energy spectra are allowed only as a limit case. Remarkably, a compact space would also imply that the Dirac and von Neumann formulations of quantum mechanics essentially coincide. We suggest that there is a definition of time leading to trajectories in quantum HJ theory having the probabilistic interpretation of the Copenhagen School.

1 Introducion

In [1] we considered a Legendre duality in the framework of the Schrödinger equation. Consistency of this mathematical structure in the context of the phase–space reveals that classical mechanics must be modified [2]. The main idea has been to implement, as in the derivation of the classical HJ equation, the transformations leading to the free state. The difference is that we did not consider the usual canonical transformation with the space coordinate q and the conjugate momentum p considered as independent variables. Rather, we performed the transformation on q and considered the transformation on p as the one induced by the coordinate transformation, by assuming that the analog of the Hamilton characteristic function transforms as a scalar field. Such a transformation leads to a basic cocycle condition which, in turn, implies that the analog of the Hamilton characteristic function must satisfy the quantum analog of the stationary HJ equation. The derivation extends to the higher dimensional non–stationary case and to the relativistic case as well [3]. A basic result in [2] is that energy quantisation for bound states follows as a consistency condition. We stress that whereas in the standard approach energy quantisation is a direct consequence of the wave–function interpretation, here it follows from the cocycle condition without any assumption on the meaning of the wave–function.

Although the latter result makes a direct connection between the approach formulated in [1]–[4] and the Copenhagen interpretation, there are still several questions to be understood. Of course, the main one is just the probabilistic interpretation. In other words, one should investigate whether starting from the cocycle condition one may derive not only the energy quantisation but also the fact that trajectories are not well–defined. Answering such a question would lead to a deep connection between the two approaches and may uncover some new structure underlying quantum mechanics. Furthermore, since the derivation of the quantum HJ equation in [1]–[4] is geometrical, it may lead to a better understanding of the problem of quantum gravity.

Here we provide a basic first answer to the above question. In particular we consider the problem of time parameterisation associated to the quantum HJ equation. The main point is that particle trajectories, as first observed by Floyd [5], should be defined by Jacobi's theorem

$$t - t_0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_0}{\partial E} \ , \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_0$ is the Hamiltonian characteristic function. This is just how trajectories are defined in classical mechanics as it implies the group velocity.

An obvious consequence of (1.1) is that time parameterisation is not defined in the case of discrete energy spectra. Consistency arguments show that this excludes the possibility of using (1.1) even in the case of continuous energy spectra. Remarkably, this also follows from the cocycle condition. In particular, we will see that the implementation of the cocycle condition fixes gluing conditions on the ratio of two linearly independent solutions of the wave–function that can be satisfied only on compact spaces, so that continuous energy spectra arise only in the decompactification limit. The fact that such gluing conditions are a basic step in the geometrical formulation of [1]–[4], related to Legendre duality [1, 6], and that led to the quantisation of the energy in the case of confining potentials, suggests that they should be always satisfied. It should be observed that in the case of a free particle the level spacing of the energy spectrum will be determined by the geometry of our three–dimensional space, essentially of the order R^{-2}, where R is some characteristic cosmological length, and therefore extremely tiny. This, of course, does not mean that such a spacing could not be detected a priori.

The fact that trajectories cannot be well–defined provides an intriguing relation between quantum HJ theory and the Copenhagen interpretation. However, the reason why they do not exist in the quantum HJ theory is that it is just the time parameterisation that does not exist. In some sense a similar view is also the one of the Copenhagen interpretation. Actually, time is not a (self–adjoint) operator, so that also in standard quantum mechanics time is not an observable.

There are additional reasons to consider the possibility that a free particle may have a quantized energy spectrum, even if the level spacing is extremely tiny. A rigorous treatment of continuous spectra requires elaborated structures and the probability of finding the particle in a given volume cannot be defined. Furthermore, it should be observed that there are two formulations of quantum mechanics in the framework of the Copenhagen interpretation. The one by von Neumann [7], where quantum states are always rays in the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and the one by Dirac [8] that in general requires the rigged Hilbert space and the eigenfunctionals. In particular, in the Dirac formulation the wave–function of a free particle in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is seen as a tempered distribution, that is an element in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the dual space of the Schwarz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In the case of compact spaces the Helmholtz equation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\psi = E\psi \ ,$$

has only a discrete spectrum, so that the two formulations would essentially coincide. More generally, a compact space would fix some natural cutoff that may play an important rôle. We also consider the problem of defining a sort of probabilistic time such that the resulting trajectories in the quantum HJ theory reproduce the probabilistic interpretation of the Copenhagen School. This suggests considering the time parameterisation following from the Schrödinger equation, namely

$$t_\psi = \frac{i\hbar}{E_n}\Big(\ln\int\psi\psi_n dq - \ln\int\psi(q,0)\psi_n dq\Big) \ .$$

In this letter we first shortly review the cocycle condition leading to the quantum HJ equation and energy quantisation. In section 3 we show that the cocycle condition can be implemented only if space is compact, so that the continuous energy spectrum is admissible only as a limit. This implies that time is not an observable in the quantum HJ theory. The cocycle condition is at the basis of quantum HJ theory. This provides the solution of the Einstein paradox, the proof of tunneling and the energy quantization theorem, without making any axiomatic interpretation of the wave–function [1]–[4]. This suggests that the cocycle condition should always hold. In this respect, even if non–compact spaces could be seen as a possible decompactification limit, this suggests that our space is compact. Furthermore, we will consider the problem of defining time parameterisation leading to a probabilistic distribution of trajectories in the quantum HJ theory.

2 The cocycle condition and energy quantization

We define $\mathcal{W}(q) = V(q) - E$, where V is the potential energy and E the energy level. The equivalence postulate (EP) of quantum mechanics is based on the standard canonical transformation leading any system to the one with trivial Hamiltonian, that is with $\mathcal{W}(q) = 0$. This leads to the classical HJ equation. The difference in the approach of Ref.[2] is that one considers the transformation on the coordinate q whereas the one on the conjugate momentum is induced by the relation $p = \partial_q \mathcal{S}_0$, by considering $\mathcal{S}_0$, the analog of the Hamilton characteristic function, as a scalar function under such a transformation of q. The derivation can be extended to the non–stationary case and to the relativistic version as well [3]. Therefore, the derivation of [2, 3] is based on the principle that all physical systems labelled by the function $\mathcal{W}(q)$ can be connected by a coordinate transformation, $q^a \to q^b = q^b(q^a)$, defined by $\mathcal{S}_0^b(q^b) = \mathcal{S}_0^a(q^a)$. This postulate implies that there always exist a coordinate transformation connecting any physical system to the one with $\mathcal{W}^0(q^0) = 0$. Inversely, this means that any physical system can be reached from the system with $\mathcal{W}^0(q^0) = 0$ by a coordinate transformation. This cannot be consistent with Classical Mechanics (CM). The reason being that in CM the physical system with $\mathcal{W}^0(q^0) = 0$ remains a fixed point under coordinate transformations. Thus, in CM it is not possible to generate all systems by a coordinate transformation from the trivial one. The EP implies the modification of CM, which is analyzed by a adding a still unknown function $Q(q)$ to the classical HJ equation. Consistency of the EP fixes the transformation properties for $\mathcal{W}(q)$,

$$\mathcal{W}^v(q^v) = (\partial_{q^v} q^a)^2 \, \mathcal{W}^a(q^a) + (q^a; q^v) \ ,$$

and for $Q(q)$,

$$Q^v(q^v) = (\partial_{q^v} q^a)^2 \, Q^a(q^a) - (q^a; q^v) \ ,$$

which fixes the cocycle condition for the inhomogeneous term

$$(q^a; q^c) = \left(\partial_{q^c} q^b\right)^2 \left[(q^a; q^b) - (q^c; q^b)\right] \ . \tag{2.1}$$

The cocycle condition is invariant under Möbius transformations and fixes the functional form of the inhomogeneous term. Furthermore, the EP fixes the identification

$$\mathcal{W}(q) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4m}\{\mathrm{e}^{(2i\mathcal{S}_0/\hbar)}, q\} \ ,$$

and

$$Q(q) = \frac{\hbar^2}{4m}\{\mathcal{S}_0, q\} \ ,$$

where $\{f, q\} = f'''/f' - \frac{3}{2}(f''/f')^2$ denotes the Schwarzian derivative. The cocycle condition, that generalizes to higher dimensions [3], implies that $\mathcal{S}_0$ is solution of the Quantum Stationary HJ Equation (QSHJE),

$$\frac{1}{2m}\left(\partial_q \mathcal{S}_0\right)^2 + V(q) - E + \frac{\hbar^2}{4m}\{\mathcal{S}_0, q\} = 0 \ .$$

It follows that

$$\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2i}{\hbar}\mathcal{S}_0} = \mathrm{e}^{i\alpha}\frac{w + i\bar{\ell}}{w - i\ell} \ ,$$

where $\ell = \ell_1 + i\ell_2$; $\{\alpha, \ell_1, \ell_2\} \in \mathbb{R}$. Here $w = \psi^D/\psi$ with ψ^D and ψ two real linearly independent solutions of the Schrödinger equation

$$\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial q^2} + V(q) - E\right)\psi(q) = 0 \ .$$

A distinguished feature of the EP formalism is that both solutions of the Schrödinger equation, ψ and ψ^D, are kept in the formalism. This can be seen from the properties of the Schwarzian derivative that show that the trivialising transformation is given by

$$q \longrightarrow q^0 = \gamma(\psi^D/\psi) \ ,$$

where $\gamma(\psi^D/\psi)$ is an arbitrary Möbius transformation of ψ^D/ψ. In general the wave–function in the EP approach is given by

$$\psi(q) = R(q)\left(A\mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathcal{S}_0} + B\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathcal{S}_0}\right) \ . \tag{2.2}$$

Furthermore, the EP necessitates that $\mathcal{S}_0(q)$ is never a constant. In particular, the quantum potential $Q(q)$ is never trivial and plays the rôle of intrinsic energy.

The EP formalism extends to higher dimensions and to the relativistic case as well [3]. Let us now review how energy quantisation arises in our formalism. The QSHJE is equivalent to the equation

$$\{w, q\} = -\frac{4m}{\hbar^2}(V(q) - E) \ .$$

This implies that $w \neq \mathit{const}$, $w \in C^2(R)$ and w'' differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$. In addition from the properties of the Schwarzian derivative it follows that

$$\{w, q^{-1}\} = q^4\{w, q\} \ ,$$

which can be seen as a direct consequence of the cocycle condition. However, such a relation is defined only if the conditions on w hold on the extended real line $\hat{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. That is

$$w \ \neq \ \mathit{const} \ , \quad w \ \in C^2(\hat{\mathbb{R}}) \ \text{ and } \ w'' \text{ differentiable on } \hat{\mathbb{R}} \ ,$$

and

$$w(-\infty) = \begin{cases} +w(+\infty) & \text{if } \ w(-\infty) \neq \pm\infty \ , \\ -w(+\infty) & \text{if } \ w(-\infty) = \pm\infty \ . \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

This means that w, and therefore the trivializing map, is a local homeomorphism of $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ into itself. The EP therefore implies continuity of (ψ^D, ψ) and $(\psi^{D\prime}, \psi')$ without assuming the probability interpretation of the wave–function. In particular, the QSHJE is defined only if the ratio $w = \psi^D/\psi$ of a pair of real linearly independent solutions of the Schrödinger equation is a local homeomorphism of the extended real line $\hat{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ into itself. This is an important feature as the $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ condition, which in the Copenhagen formulation is a consequence of the axiomatic interpretation of the wave–function, directly follows as a basic theorem which only uses the geometrical gluing conditions of w at $q = \pm\infty$, as implied by the EP. In particular, denoting by q_- (q_+) the lowest (highest) q for which $V(q) - E$ changes sign, we have [2]

If

$$V(q)-E\geq\begin{cases}P_-^2>0\ , & q<q_-\ ,\\ P_+^2>0\ , & q>q_+\ ,\end{cases}\tag{2.4}$$

then $w=\psi^D/\psi$ *is a local self–homeomorphism of* $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ *if and only if the corresponding Schrödinger equation has an* $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ *solution.*

Thus, since the QSHJE is defined if and only if w is a local self–homeomorphism of $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$, this theorem implies that energy quantisation *directly* follows from the QSHJE itself. Therefore, basic characteristics of QM are predicted by the EP as they arise by self–consistency from the EP without further assumptions. This is a fundamental aspect as in the standard formulation of QM the $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ condition is a consequence of the probabilistic interpretation of the wave–function.

3 Time parameterisation

The representation of the EP approach as a modification of the classical HJ theory is reminiscent of Bohm's formulation of quantum mechanics. However, we emphasize that the two approaches are fundamentally distinct [2]. Bohmian mechanics sets $\psi(q)=R(q)\mathrm{e}^{iS/\hbar}$, where ψ is the wave–function. The EP on the other hand necessitates that the wave–function is taken in the general form (2.2). This condition is reminiscent of the necessity in quantum field theories of using the two solutions of the relativistic quantum equations.

In Bohmian mechanics time parameterisation is defined by identifying the dual variable p with the mechanical momentum, *i.e.* by setting

$$p=\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}}{\partial q}=m\dot{q}\ ,\tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is the solution of the quantum HJ equation. In the classical HJ theory time parameterisation is introduced by using Jacobi theorem

$$t-t_0=\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}_0^{\rm cl}}{\partial E}\ ,\tag{3.2}$$

that leads to group velocity. In CM this is equivalent to identifying the conjugate momentum with the mechanical one. Namely, setting $p=\partial_q\mathcal{S}_0^{\rm cl}=m\dot{q}$, yields (3.2), which provides the trajectory $q=q(t)$. Bohmian mechanics therefore brings back the notion of trajectories for point particles, since we may solve for $q(t)$.

However, we note that the agreement between the definition of time by Eq.(3.1) and its definition by Jacobi theorem (3.2) is no longer true in quantum mechanics. The use of the latter definition in quantum mechanics, that is

$$t-t_0=\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}_0^{\rm qm}}{\partial E}\ ,\tag{3.3}$$

has been first proposed by Floyd [5]. In quantum HJ theory this leads to

$$t-t_0=\frac{m}{2}\int_{q_0}^{q}dx\frac{1-\partial_E Q}{(E-V-Q)^{1/2}}\ ,$$

so that

$$m\frac{dq}{dt}=\frac{\partial_q S_0^{\rm qm}}{(1-\partial_E\mathcal{V})} ,$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ denotes the combined potential $\mathcal{V}=V(q)+Q(q)$. Therefore, in quantum mechanics the time parameterisations (3.1) and (3.2) do not coincide with its definition via Jacobi theorem.

Floyd proposal (3.3) would in principle provide a trajectory representation of quantum mechanics which would seem to be in contradiction with the inherently probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics. We argue that the EP of quantum mechanics implies that the definition (3.3) is invalid as a fundamental definition of time. We emphasize, however, that this does not mean that the parameterisation provided by Eq.(3.3) cannot be useful. In fact, it is quite effective to perform semi–classical approximations. In this respect we note the successful application in studies of molecular dynamics [9].

It is clear that in the case of quantized energy spectra (3.3) is not defined. On the other hand, time parameterisation should be a universal concept, so that one should consider a time parameterisation which is consistent in both cases of discrete and continuous spectra. This essentially would exclude (3.3) also in the case of continuous spectra. There is however a more stringent argument to show that (3.3) cannot be used to define parameterisation. In particular, we now show that the QSHJE is defined only in the case of discrete spectrum with the case of continuous spectrum arising only as a limit case. We saw that the cocycle condition led to the QSHJE written as a Schwarzian equation. In particular, we established that the gluing conditions should always hold. Let us now consider the case of a continuous spectrum. Without loss of generality, we may consider the case when for large q the potential is zero. For large q two associated real independent solutions of the Schödinger equation are $\psi=\sin kq$, $\psi^D=\cos kq$. This means that for large q we have

$$w=\tan kq .$$

On the other hand, whereas this function at finite distance is a local homeomorphism, it is not the case when considering the entire real axis. This can be also seen by considering a free particle in an infinitely deep well and considering the periodicity conditions. This is equivalent to consider the particle in S^1 and then sending its radius R to infinity. For any finite R the ratio of two linearly independent solutions is a local homeomorphism of S^1 and the spectrum is discrete. In the $R\to\infty$ limit the gluing condition is no longer under control. In the case of the free particle in an infinitely deep potential well of width L, the energy levels are

$$E_n=\frac{\hbar^2\pi^2}{2mL^2}n^2 , \qquad n\in\mathbb{N} .$$

It follows that for any but finite value of L the spectrum is discrete. We then arrive to the conclusion that imposing the cocycle condition requires a discrete spectrum which in turn implies that the time parameterisation by Jacobi theorem cannot be defined. This can be generalized to the free particle in any space dimension leading to the same conclusion. On the other hand, it is a general theorem that the equation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\psi=E\psi ,$$

in bounded domains of $\mathbb{R}^n$, therefore including e.g. the $(n-1)$–sphere S^{n-1}, has only a discrete spectrum. At the level of the quantum HJ theory, this is just a consequence of the non–triviality of the quantum potential.

Since trajectories do not exist in the EP approach, we can consider finite differences instead of derivatives,

$$t_n = \frac{\mathcal{S}_0(E_{n+1}) - \mathcal{S}_0(E_n)}{E_{n+1} - E_n} \ .$$

There is however another interesting possibility. One may think that time itself is defined as a sort of random parameter whose distribution is fixed by the properties of the distribution of the energy eigenvalues. In other words, instead of considering finite difference, that gives $t = t(E)$, we may search for a more intrinsic definition. The idea is that the wave–function depends on E, so one may formally invert this relation to $E = E(\psi)$. This leads to consider the definition of time as $t_\psi = t(\psi)$. In particular, since for time independent potentials the Schrödinger equation implies

$$\psi(q,t) = \sum_n c_n e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}E_n t}\psi_n(q) \ ,$$

where $H\psi_n = E_n\psi_n$, we have

$$t_\psi = \frac{i\hbar}{E_n}\Big(\ln\int \psi\psi_n dq - \ln\int \psi(q,0)\psi_n dq\Big) \ , \tag{3.4}$$

where we used $\psi_n \in \mathbb{R}$. This suggests that there exists a time parameterisation leading to probabilistic interpretation of trajectories in quantum HJ theory.

4 Conclusions

Understanding the synthesis of quantum mechanics and general relativity remains the pivotal goal of fundamental physics. The main effort in this endeavour is in the framework of string theory. String theory provides a self–consistent perturbative approach to quantum gravity. The main achievement of string theory is that it gives rise to the gauge and matter ingredients of elementary particle physics, and predicts the number of degrees of freedom required to obtain a consistent theory. String theory therefore enables the development of a phenomenological approach to quantum gravity. The state of the art in this regard is the construction of Minimal Standard Heterotic String Models (see *e.g.* [10] and references therein). Over the past few years important progress has also been achieved in the understanding of the perturbative expansion of string theory for genus g Riemann surfaces, see for example [11] and references therein. Despite its successes, string theory does not provide a conceptual starting point for formulating quantum gravity. What we seek is a fundamental hypothesis of which, possibly, string theories arise as perturbative limits. A basic property of string theory is T–duality [12], which may be viewed as phase–space duality in compact space.

In this paper we examined the implications on the definability of time as a fundamental microscopic variable in the EP approach to quantum mechanics. We first showed that identification of the conjugate momentum with the mechanical momentum, as is done in

Bohmian mechanics, is inconsistent with its derivation from Jacobi's theorem. Furthermore, the fundamental quantisation of energy also implies that Jacobi theorem cannot be used to define time as a fundamental continuous parameter in the EP approach. We proposed that this feature of the EP of quantum mechanics is at the heart of the probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics. In turn, if time cannot be defined as a microscopic variable, then we cannot define trajectories at a basic level, which can only be defined classically or semi–classically.

The quantum HJ theory leads to possible observational effects. For example, it may lead to modified dispersion relations of relativistic velocities. Possible modified dispersion relations will be explored in the coming years with greater accuracy [13]. Additionally, the compactness of space has basic observational consequences and forthcoming evidence for it may exist in the cosmic microwave background radiation [14].

Acknowledgements

AEF is supported by STFC under contract ST/J000493/1. MM is supported by the Padova University Project CPDA119349 and by the MIUR-PRIN contract 2009-KHZKRX.

References

[1] A.E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 163.

[2] A.E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Phys. Lett. **B450** (1999) 34; Phys. Lett. **B437** (1998) 369; Phys. Lett. **A249** (1998) 180; Phys. Lett. **B445** (1998) 77; Phys. Lett. **B445** (1998) 357; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A15** (2000) 1869; arXiv:0912.1225, contribute to the book *Quantum Trajectories*, Ed. P. Chattaraj, Taylor&Francis/CRC Press 2011.

[3] G. Bertoldi, A.E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Class. Quant. Grav. **17** (2000) 3965.

[4] M. Matone, Found. Phys. Lett. **15** (2002) 311; Braz. J. Phys. **35** (2005) 316, 2nd International Workshop DICE2004.

[5] E.R. Floyd, Phys. Rev. **D25** (1982) 1547; **26** (1982) 1339; **29** (1984) 1842; **34** (1986) 3246; Found. Phys. Lett. **9** (1996) 489; **13** (2000) 235; Phys. Lett. **A214** (1996) 259;

Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A14** (1999) 1111; **15** (2000) 1363.

Top of Form 1 Bottom of Form 1

[6] M. Matone, Phys. Lett. **B357** (1995) 342; Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 7354;

Nucl. Phys. **B656** (2003) 78.

[7] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton, 1996.

[8] P. A. M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Oxford, 1988.

[9] R.E. Wyatt, *Quantum dynamics with trajectories: introduction to quantum hydrodynamics*, Springer, 2005; B. Poirier, J. Chem. Phys. **121** (2004) 4501.

[10] A.E. Faraggi, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Yuan, Nucl. Phys. **B335** (1990) 347; A.E. Faraggi, Phys. Lett. **B278** (1992) 131; Nucl. Phys. **B387** (1992) 239; G.B. Cleaver, A.E. Faraggi and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B455** (1999) 135; K. Christodoulides, A.E. Faraggi and J. Rizos, Phys. Lett. **B702** (2011) 81.

[11] M. Matone and R. Volpato, Nucl. Phys. **B732** (2006) 321; Nucl. Phys. **B806** (2009) 735; Nucl. Phys. **B839** (2010) 21; J. Math. Phys. **52** (2011) 102305; arXiv:math/0605734, Math. Ann. DOI: 10.1007/s00208-012-0787-z; arXiv:1102.0006, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. in press; M. Matone, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10** (1995) 289; JHEP 1210 (2012) 175; arXiv:1209.6049; arXiv:1209.6351, JHEP in press.

[12] A. Giveon, M. Porrati and E. Rabinovici, Phys. Rep. **244** (1994) 77.

[13] M. Actis *et al*, Exper. Astron. 32 (2011) 193.

[14] G. Aslanyan, A.V. Manohar, JCAP **1206** (2012) 003.